JL, HR, DW - attached letter to Jim Tague, possible use in 75-226 1/19/77

We had a long talk last night.

He had obtained and read and been turned on by Post Mortem.

He does appear to be willing to be of whatever help he can.

Under any circumstances an oral history would be helpful, particularly because there was an immediate effort to pretend he never happened.

The value I see in 75-226, the one I omit from my letter for the reasons stated and no other, is his description of the damage. It was a mark and not a smear, the exact reverse of the FBI representation. In addition, he is clear on its dimensions. His recollection has a credible base, something I should have recognized and did not - the pen in the picture. It is the late Buddy Walthers' and it is in the pix taken on the south side of Elm St.Even the poses are alike in both sets of pix.

The FBI claims to have measured a "smear " 1 3/4" by 1", obviously what could not possible have been caused by any bullet. Tague says it was about a quarter of an inch wide, more or less as wide as Walthers' pen. I think he said an inch long. Now we have Shaneyfelt under oath on the one dimension and the character, smear and no mark, and Tague, who above all humans was there at the time swearing it was no such thing, and we subpoena the curbstone itself and elt Tague examine it (alternative depose in Archives), and there is a problem for the court to resolve plus the basis for a press conference after t at hearing, what we have never done before. Or even before it.

What happened to the mark? What did the FBI do when the curbstone was not identical with the contemporaneous pix? Just beginning points. This can go far. It could go much farthur if I could get to Dallas for a while and speak to others. some of whom I think would not be willing to come forward. And don8t forget, now that PM is out I can testify. We have a situation comparable to the one Garrison blew at the outset of the case before Halleck. I can testify both as an expert and on compliance and on motive with compliance the issue and truthfulness of the defendant an issue and particularly with the mandate of the appeals court.

Hastily,